Case 1:15-cr-00643-PKC Document 363 Filed 01/26/17 Page 1 of 33

H1BSGALS UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 15 CR 643 (PKC) V. 5 JARED GALANIS, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. January 11, 2017 9 12:00 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. P. KEVIN CASTEL, 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York AIMEE HECTOR 17 REBECCA MERMELSTEIN BRIAN R. BLAIS 18 Assistant United States Attorneys MURPHY, PEARSON, BRADLEY & FEENEY 19 Attorneys for Defendant 20 BY: JAMES A. LASSART 21 ALSO PRESENT: Shannon Bieniek, FBI Agent 22 23 24 25

(case called)

MS. HECTOR: Good afternoon, your Honor.

Aimee Hector, Rebecca Mermelstein, and Brian Blais for the government. With us at counsel table is Shannon Bieniek from the FBI.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

For the defendant?

MR. LASSART: Good afternoon, your Honor. James
Lassart appearing on behalf of Jared Galanis. My client is
present.

THE COURT: Let me go through the materials I have, and the question will be whether I have everything I should have.

I have a presentence report recommendation and addendum transmitted to me on December 28, 2016, I have a submission from the government dated January 6, and a supplemental submission dated January 10 from the government.

I also have a sentencing memorandum submitted by the defense, which was filed in mid December, it looks like around December 28, if I'm reading that correctly. Of course, there are many helpful exhibits attached to the defendant's submission, including a report by a forensic medical individual who has interpreted certain health records, and there are a series of letters from family members, in-laws, and friends in support of the defendant.

I also have a letter that was submitted by Paul Grand, 1 writing without any particular standing in this matter, former 2 3 counsel to Defendant John Galanis, and a response from the government dated November 18, 2016. 4 5 Do I have everything I should have on the subject of 6 sentencing? 7 MS. HECTOR: I believe so, your Honor. 8 MR. LASSART: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Has the defendant, in fact, read, 10 reviewed, and discussed with you the presentence report recommendation and addendum? 11 12 MR. LASSART: He has, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Does the defendant have any objections to 14 the facts set forth in the presentence report? 15 MR. LASSART: Our objections were noted and are noted in the addendum, your Honor. 16 17 THE COURT: Are there any that you continue to press? 18 MR. LASSART: No, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Any objections to the guideline 20 calculation in the presentence report? 21 MR. LASSART: No objection to the guideline 2.2 calculation. 23 THE COURT: Let me hear from the government. Do I 24 have everything I should have on sentencing?

MS. HECTOR: Yes, your Honor, you do.

25

THE COURT: Any objection to the facts set forth in the presentence report?

MS. HECTOR: Your Honor, we do agree that the facts section recites the original indictment that does attribute the phone directly to Jared Galanis. I think everyone is aware that we are all now in agreement that it more accurately should read "a phone subscribed in the name of Jared Galanis." I think we are all on the same page as to the facts.

THE COURT: I took it that that was the original indictment, and my understanding is that the phone was used by John Galanis and not by Jared Galanis.

Is that correct, Mr. Lassart?

MR. LASSART: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, I understand the government does not agree with the methodology used in calculating the guidelines, but does agree with the ultimate conclusion that defendant is in total offense level 16, criminal history category I?

MS. HECTOR: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I will now give defense counsel an opportunity to speak on behalf of the defendant.

MR. LASSART: Thank you, your Honor.

In addition to the submissions that were sent in,

I have a few additional comments to make. I think it is

important to note that Jared is not a coconspirator in this

matter, and he is guilty, as he pled guilty, to misprision of a felony. It is also important to note that he became aware of his father's criminal impersonation and criminal conduct in 2011. He stopped at that time the usage of his name, and ultimately, in 2012, he moved to Maryland for a couple of reasons. One, to help assist in his wife's healthcare, but also to distance himself from the problems that his brother and father were engaged in. Probably his separation is best described by looking at what went on, which resulted in a second indictment in both his father and his brother.

THE COURT: Well, let me understand what you just posited. That when he learned that his father was using the e-mail account, it promptly stopped or it caused him to stop immediately?

MR. LASSART: Yes. Not only the e-mail account, but the phone.

In 2011, he basically discovered a lot of e-mail activities when a subpoena occurred from the SEC.

THE COURT: Are you arguing that he didn't commit any crime here?

MR. LASSART: No. He concealed. There was some ongoing activity that he became aware of and he concealed it. Also, he wasn't forthcoming with the SEC as to who the drafter of those e-mails were.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LASSART: In other words, he concealed items that he should have revealed.

THE COURT: When you say "not forthcoming," he was asked about it and he did not tell them the truth as he knew it?

MR. LASSART: Exactly. He basically treated the e-mail as if they were his when he discovered them to the SEC.

THE COURT: All right. And tell me about what he did to enable transfers out of the IOLTA account.

MR. LASSART: The IOLTA account was primarily active during the course, prior to the 2011 discovery. His brother, he represented his brother on transactional matters.

During that time, he would receive what were basically settlement dollars and distribute those settlement dollars out of his IOLTA account based on the direction of his brother.

That's what he did.

THE COURT: Your position is there was no criminal activity with regard to the disbursement of funds from the IOLTA account, is that what you're saying?

MR. LASSART: I am not say there was no criminal activity, but it wasn't Jared's criminal activity. These IOLTA funds came from transactions that his brother engaged in and his father engaged in in which there was criminal conduct. However, Jared's action was basically to treat them as if they were settlement dollars coming out of business transactions.

THE COURT: Well, that may have been how he treated them. What I am trying to get to the bottom of is whether he knew the truth of their origins and treated them as if they were settlement funds. That's an entirely different situation. And it is important that I understand how he directed funds from that account and whether he did so aware of criminal activity by his father and his brother.

MR. LASSART: He was unaware of the criminal activity that developed those funds and disbursed them according to the direction of his brother.

THE COURT: Thinking that they were lawfully obtained dollars?

MR. LASSART: That's right.

The funds are accounted for in the distribution, so there wasn't any attempt to in any way structure or hide the direction of the funds or the source of the funds.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LASSART: Did I answer your question, your Honor?

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. LASSART: Now, the fact of the matter is that the government has gathered a large deal of information regarding Jared's financials, and I think what they will have discovered is that he did not lead a lavish lifestyle, that he is a renter now in Maryland, that he now drives to support his family through Lyft. He is not benefactor of these huge dollars that

were generated from the criminal activity.

This conviction ended his legal career, and he is now the essential and primary caregiver for his wife, as we get to the 3553 criteria. In looking at this, the purpose of sentencing is that just punishment, of course, general deterrence, specific deterrence, and rehabilitation, these policies basically direct that a minimal sentence is needed to achieve those goals.

Now, one of the critical factors in the 3553 is his care and extremely important care for his disabled wife. He is an essential caregiver, and our medical submissions, I think, explain his role, the necessity of his role, and the terrible disease she suffers from.

Now, in conjunction with that, we ask the court to take that into consideration at the time of sentencing.

THE COURT: This is the submission from the forensic nurse who has reviewed medical records for the purpose of opining on the subject?

MR. LASSART: Yes, your Honor.

In addition to that, we have a letter directly from her caregiver, a doctor $\ensuremath{\mathsf{--}}$

THE COURT: The geneticist?

MR. LASSART: Yes.

THE COURT: I saw that.

MR. LASSART: Those are what I am referring to.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. LASSART: Now, let me address briefly the restitution issue in the case, that which we received information on in the last few days.

In this matter, restitution for Jared should not be assessed as joint several liability with the coconspirators in this case, with the persons who are coconspirators, of which he is not one of them.

He did not participate in that conspiracy and the attributable harm, which it's difficult to attribute, I think, and not appropriate to attribute to Jared his conduct as to causing any form of harm in the form of taking of money from the purported victims.

Marine case and the Lentil case. We cited the Mariano case. The point of that particular authority in those is that there can be, at times, restitution attributed to misprision of a felony. Those cases are clearly distinguishable from the facts of this case in both of those cases. There was a long-term knowledge and a concealment of a lengthy ongoing fraud, that if it had been identified earlier, would have caused the cessation of some of these losses.

In this instance, Jared's conduct, though allowing for some additional harm to victims, was so late in the game, that much of the fraud and the harm of these victims was caused

before his discovery of that in 2011. As a result, a majority of the damage, in our view, was done prior to Jared's discovery, and therefore he should not be penalized in a joint several manner with individuals who created this particular scheme, these schemes.

Now, I know some of the issues that the government has raised is that Jared had provided the tools of this to his father, but it should be known that his father was given a phone in 2004 by Jared when he couldn't get a phone and he was just coming out of prison. And he did authorize his father to use his e-mail to assist in dealing with the credit issues of his mother.

THE COURT: Well, let's talk about that so that I have a better understanding.

What did he authorize in terms of e-mail usage? He authorized John Galanis to have an e-mail account through his law firm, or he authorized John Galanis to use an account which, to other persons, would appear to be an e-mail sent by Jared Galanis?

MR. LASSART: My belief is he authorized John Galanis, the way I understand it, to use the account. John then took liberties and created his own e-mail within that account, but also used Jared's. We have e-mails that show John's use of the Google account with different e-mail addresses, but he used Jared's e-mail address.

THE COURT: Well, this is a little confusing to me, given the ease with which one can open a Gmail account in five minutes for free.

What was Jared's intent in authorizing his father to use -- was this the sentinel e-mail account?

MR. LASSART: Yes.

THE COURT: -- using a sentinel account if the father was not associated with sentinel?

MR. LASSART: His intent was that his father would deal with his mother's credit. I don't think there was much more thought about it than that.

THE COURT: But why wouldn't you say, Dad, come over here. I am going to do this for you. We are going to get you a Gmail account. We'll be done in five minutes. Here you go.

MR. LASSART: I can't answer that question. I can just tell you what occurred.

What I can tell you is that he allowed his father to use his e-mail account and never monitored that nor gave it any additional thought. What John Galanis ended up doing was created a filter on that e-mail account, and then filtered incoming e-mail from certain individuals into an account that was a file. It was basically for his mother's credit. And that was as a result, they didn't get into the general e-mail that Jared was reviewing, at least most of them didn't, and they would go to this filtered file.

As far as the phone, he basically impersonated Jared in phone calls and used that phone to end up in tracting activities. Jared gave him that phone and he used that number from 2004 on, and then there was a switch of phones and he never monitored what his father was doing on that.

THE COURT: How is the phone any different to a person receiving a call on the phone than one purchased at a

MR. LASSART: I'm sorry. I guess I don't understand it.

convenience store as a prepaid phone?

THE COURT: I guess what I'm getting at is the phone number identified with that phone publicly identified as a Sentinel telephone number, so that the person getting the call would think they were getting a call from the law firm, or was it just a randomly assigned number, the same as one would get if you purchased a prepaid phone?

MR. LASSART: It was a randomly assigned number. The billing went and subscription was Jared's at the firm, but it wasn't the firm's number.

THE COURT: And this would not be something that would be apparent to anyone else in the world?

MR. LASSART: That's right.

THE COURT: You wouldn't know that you were getting a call on Jared's phone at all?

MR. LASSART: That's right.

THE COURT: Unlike the Sentinel e-mail, where you would know the Sentinel name would be in the e-mail address.

MR. LASSART: That's correct.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. LASSART: Now, with all these factors before this court, I would ask the court to consider doing the following: to follow the recommendation of the probation in the PSR. However, if the court does not follow the recommendation in the PSR. I would ask that the court impose a sentence that would allow for home detention. In conjunction with that, of course if there is a need for custodial time. I would ask for an opportunity to have Jared self-surrender.

I ask the court to look at this young man and understand the position he was put in by his family, a family whose father was not available during the first 20-some odd years of his life, and the fact of trust he allowed, whether you call it foolish or not, which is largely the type of person you'll see reflected in the various people who wrote on his behalf.

They placed him in a terrible position and he reacted improperly once he understood that there was activity going on and you can see it. He's not benefactor of this, and though, to some degree, the activities of his family have ruined his professional career, he is not going to practice law. He can't practice law any longer, and his focus now is on what he can do

to benefit himself in the sense of my family and move on from his life. I think that probation's recommendation is reasonable and I would ask the court to follow that.

If the court ultimately, after the discussion from the prosecution, wishes to hear from Jared directly, he is prepared to talk to the court as necessary.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LASSART: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Galanis, this is your opportunity to speak, to address the court directly, to bring to my attention any facts or circumstances that you believe I should take account of. If there is anything you wish to say, this is the time to say it.

MR. MADDOX: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I can hear you fine. You can stand up.

MR. MADDOX: Thank you, your Honor.

I stand before you today, I can honestly tell you that I truly and deeply regret the crime that committed and the harm that I have caused.

Concealing the conspiracy is by far the biggest mistake of my life. I put myself and others in my family before the good of others. I wish I could take back those errors. I do, and conduct myself in a way that I know is the right way and a bay that I know I will conduct myself in the future.

I am so ashamed that I was not able to exhibit the judgment and the character that I know I am capable of. I will spend the rest of my life regretting these decisions and figuring out a way to make things better in this world. I don't know that I'll ever be able to restore the harm caused by my bad decisions, but I can tell you that I will try. I will make it my life's work never to make an error like this again.

I failed society, my wife, my family, especially my family in Maryland, my friends, I failed myself. A person who does these things is not the person that I have spent so many years building and cultivating, and it is not the person I will be in the future.

If given the chance by your Honor, I will plan to continue to be of help to my wife, especially in navigating her difficult health situation, and I plan to continue to push my career in new directions. While I know my work life has been forever altered by what I have done, I do believe I can be a contributing member of society.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Galanis.

MR. MADDOX: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: This is the government's opportunity to speak.

MS. HECTOR: Thank you, your Honor.

A few responses to what defense counsel has said and what was articulated in his papers.

2.2

I think the thrust of the defense argument in favor of Mr. Galanis is that he was a victim in many ways of this fraud. We believe that really understates both his level of culpability and level of involvement.

You know, first, focusing on this e-mail account.

There are not two e-mail accounts here. This is an e-mail account set up as a law firm personal e-mail account,

JMG@Sentinellaw.com, subscribed by Mr. Galanis, paid for by

Mr. Galanis. He gave access to that account, not a separate -there's not a separate JohnGalanis@Sentinellaw. It is that
account that he gave access to his father to allegedly for
purposes of allowing his father to communicate with credit
reporting agencies under the guise of a lawyer. Clearly the
purpose of this was to give his father either greater
credibility, greater negotiating power, whatever, in
communication with these credit reporting agencies.

John Galanis had, throughout the course of this case, other e-mail addresses and he could make another e-mail address. So the sort of initiation of this access was fraudulent itself. Mr. Jared Galanis is a lawyer and he has ethical obligations. So that, according to Jared Galanis, was the onset of his father's use of his account.

Now, there is no dispute that this account was used extensively in connection with and in furtherance of the fraud. There was e-mails to brokerage accounts, e-mails directing

movement of shares, e-mails directing transfers of shares, e-mails directing wires. Your Honor heard at the trial of Mr. Hurst about how the shares were deposited into an account at Roth and how they moved through various different accounts with different brokerage firms, as particular brokerage firms got concerns about the shares. There was e-mails with Ymer Shahini. There was e-mails with Jason Galanis. There are lots of e-mails relevant to the conduct.

Now, defense counsel has proffered this explanation that there was an "elaborate filtering system setup," but we have been provided with no further specificity as to how that filtering system was set up, whose e-mail addresses were filtered. When one said filtered, I guess what comes to mind, could it have been filtered into a sub folder, was that sub folder nonetheless accessible, were responses to those e-mails still in the sent mail. There are so many e-mail addresses and sort of counter parties to these e-mails that it becomes hard to disentangle.

So we have an e-mail account that we agree was used by both Jared Galanis and John Galanis. There are e-mails, the content of which has personal information that it is clearly one or the other, but then there is a large segment of e-mails that are more difficult. And the government has endeavored extensively to go through these e-mails and to try to pair it up with phone calls on phones attributed to Jared or John to

try to disaggregate, and it is very difficult to do so.

But Jared admitted in his allocution that, at some point, he became aware of this. He says 2011. We don't know, your Honor. There are a lot of e-mails in 2010 along these lines.

THE COURT: Yes, but let's look at where we are.

MS. HECTOR: Yes.

THE COURT: He has admitted his guilt to the crime of misprision of felony. He, through his counsel, asserts that he had guilty knowledge sometime in 2011. While it is relevant to the sentencing decision, it is considerably more relevant to the restitution issue.

MS. HECTOR: Fair enough.

THE COURT: Certainly on the restitution issue, it's the government's burden of proof. It would seem to me that the construct is correct, that it doesn't begin with joint and several liability as it might in a conspiracy case. But one engages in the exercise of what would have happened to the victims if Mr. Jared Galanis had not committed the crime of misprision of felony.

What I am hearing is that he became aware in 2011, and he lied to the SEC about it. Presumably, at the time of the lies to the SEC, I think you're going to tell me the horse was already out of the barn, so that could not have caused anyone injury. I don't know enough about the timing to know what the

consequence of 2011 is, but it seems to me -- and maybe this makes things easier for today's purposes -- that I have 90 days to resolve the restitution issue, and that the government has to sit down across the table from Mr. Lassart -- and maybe since he's in town, this is not a bad day to do it -- and talk about the evidence and see whether or not you can get close to an agreement. And if you can't get close to an agreement, then your alternative is to have a hearing and see whether you can prove your case by a preponderance of the evidence. I think the legal principles, I don't think there is going to be a disagreement in this room as to what those principles are.

Now, it is still relevant to the sentencing decision of whether there is evidence that Jared Galanis is not being straight with the court even today on January 11, when he says to his lawyer that he first learned in 2011. But I think that requires more than pointing out that it's difficult. It's the government's burden to show what it has in that regard.

MS. HECTOR: Yes, your Honor.

I am not surprised that your Honor is coming to this issue, obviously. I don't think, to the extent that we were to provide additional evidence to substantiate or to evidence exactly when Mr. Galanis was likely to have come into greater knowledge, I don't necessarily think it would be a hearing with testimony. I don't frankly think there would be a witness to that. I think it would be greater detail and specificity of

the e-mails and argument around what those e-mails demonstrate as to who was the likely recipient or sender of those e-mails.

Your Honor, the government could do that. I agree with your Honor that it is maybe even more relevant with respect to the restitution issue of whether if he had alerted someone to this fraud at the time, whether the loss of these victims would have been prevented. But to the extent that your Honor is interested, for purposes of the appropriate sentence in this case, for the government to provide additional information with respect to the timing of his likely knowledge, we can do that.

THE COURT: Well, the problem I have here is this sentencing date has been known for a long time. The government has devoted enormous resources to this case. The government had the opportunity to prepare and did prepare not only a sentencing submission, but a supplemental sentencing submission. I don't think it is appropriate. It may be one thing to require it with regard to the restitution obligation, but this is judgment day. And while it is judgment day for Jared Galanis, it is also judgment day for the government.

MS. HECTOR: Certainly, your Honor.

I hear you on that, and while we may be able to proffer to your Honor some additional specificity, obviously that may not be adequate in this context.

THE COURT: There's a difference between, listen,

2.2

the nature of my job is I do a lot of civil cases in this courthouse. What someone could show on a knew or should-have-known standard is not the relevant standard here. You could make out a very compelling case that a reasonable person should have engaged in an inquiry.

But for you, maybe not beyond a reasonable doubt, but beyond a preponderance, make out a local blindness case in that direction. If you don't have evidence otherwise, it's not simply enough to show that somebody should have inquired further. That's a standard the law accepts in many arenas, but this is not one of them.

MS. HECTOR: Well, your Honor, then, you know, I think it may be most useful to focus on what is not in dispute for purposes of today.

I think that is sort of where I began my remarks, which is, you know, it is not in dispute that Jared Galanis provided his father, who had three prior convictions for fraudulent conduct, with access to his law firm e-mail account for the purpose of conducting business. And that, in fact, Mr. Galanis went on to utilize that account in other capacities beyond this initial authority, which was problematic authority from the outset.

THE COURT: It sounds to me like there's almost agreement that that was the original sin. Now, whether it's not necessarily the crime to which he's entered a plea of

guilty here, it originates with that.

MS. HECTOR: So the account was therefore utilized to conduct a lot of this activity. And just to be clear, you know, the government believes that Jared Galanis was aware of that activity prior to 2011, but that it was utilized to conduct a lot of this activity.

I don't think they dispute that Jared Galanis was involved in e-mail correspondence in furtherance of the fraud. They dispute, I think, his level of knowledge. But he certainly -- and I don't think they can dispute this -- was involved in e-mail correspondence around the bringing over of these shares, the depositing of them into accounts, the moving of them, and the transfer of proceeds through his IOLTA account that his father did not have access to.

THE COURT: Well, what's been proffered here today is that, with regard to his IOLTA account, this is why I asked the question with regard to that. He had no knowledge he was assisting in a criminal activity. He thought that the transfer was lawful.

Now, it doesn't surprise me that a defendant's lawyer might make that assertion. You have evidence that contradicts that assertion.

MS. HECTOR: Your Honor, how I would respond to that is Jared Galanis was certainly in communication with Roth Capital. That is the first brokerage firm into which the

Shahini shares were deposited.

If your Honor remembers from the trial, the shares came into the account, and Mason Octanis (phonetic) had concerns about the providence of those shares, the appropriateness of those shares, because there was an e-mail to Roth Capital from Jared Galanis attaching documentation, the Barry Finer letters and some other letters that demonstrated that those shares had restrictions on them, and that there were restrictions with respect to the sale of those shares in the United States.

Now, there are phone communications from the Jared phone, not the phone that was allegedly used and that we believe to be used by the father, from the Jared phone to Roth Capital around that time to suggest that Jared was the person in communication with Roth Capital. And as you recall, then the shares, Roth Capital rejects the shares and they get moved to C.K. Cooper. Then those shares eventually are sold, and proceeds of those Shahini sales are funneled through the IOLTA account.

Now, does that set up a fairly strong argument that

Jared Galanis, at least, was aware that shares came into an
account? He was aware that there were problems perceived by

Roth Capital about these shares, that they get moved to another
account. He is aware of the movement of these shares to

various accounts and that the shares are sold and then money

gets funneled through his IOLTA account. OK.

So I bring forth these facts because while I understand the court's concern that we are sort of engaging in a significant factual dispute here, about which there is, you know, not definitive evidence, I understand that, but I also don't want to stand here and let the court have a misimpression about the state of our belief as to the evidence of Jared's involvement and knowledge in this case.

So that sort of goes back to the point that, you know, I don't think they dispute that Jared is involved in the conduct, the underlying conduct. The question, of course, is what is the state of his knowledge. You know, he admitted in his allocution that at some point he became — without temporal specificity, at some point he became aware of the fraud and concealed it. And we are proffering to your Honor that this e-mail account has numerous e-mails, and it is difficult and, in fact, in some ways I know they don't have a burden to do so.

We are hamstrung by the fact that we are given a very incomplete and scant explanation for this elaborate filtering system. If we were given more of an explanation, we might be in a better position to refute it. Because if someone said to us, here is a list of the e-mail accounts that were filtered and this is how they were filtered, we could then go back to those specific e-mails and say, does it make sense that that was what happening? And we can't, so...

1 THE COURT: Do you want me to adjourn the sentencing? Are you asking me to adjourn the sentencing? 2 3 MS. HECTOR: Your Honor, can I have a moment? 4 THE COURT: Yes. 5 (Pause) MS. HECTOR: Your Honor, no. We are not requesting 6 7 to adjourn the sentencing. We would prefer to move forward on the record as it stands right now before your Honor. 8 9 extent that additional work needs to be done with respect to 10 the restitution, we obviously will do that and, you know, and 11 follow your Honor's instructions to meet with Mr. Lassert on 12 that. 13 But I think we prefer to leave it, at this point, that 14 the filtering is something that has been proffered by the 15 defendant, that there is no evidence of its existence or not. THE COURT: Well, as a result of the grand jury's 16 17 investigation, I assume you had access to the relevant e-mails 18 and to the system? 19 MS. HECTOR: We contacted the service provider, and 20 they unfortunately have no information on their system that 21 could demonstrate whether or not that filtering occurred. So 22 we made efforts to try to substantiate that, but were unable to 23 do so. 24 THE COURT: OK. Anything else? 25 MS. HECTOR: Unless your Honor has further questions,

no.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Lassert, I don't ordinarily do this, but I will extend you an opportunity for a brief response if there is any point that was raised that you feel you wish to respond to.

MR. LASSART: Your Honor, I don't see any additional comment on what is a dispute on the facts. I think the court knows. If the court has a question, I would be more than happy to answer it.

THE COURT: Thank you.

This is the court's statement of reasons for the sentence to be imposed on Jared Galanis. In sentencing the defendant, I have considered all the materials that I referenced at the outset, I have considered the thoughtful comments of Ms. Hector and Mr. Lassart, as well as the sincere statement of Mr. Galanis. I have considered each of the factors set forth in Section 3553(a). I need not recount all that I have considered, but I have considered it all.

There is little doubt here about one aspect of the facts, and that is that the defendant has admitted Count Eight of the indictment, that he was aware of his father's participation in a conspiracy to defraud Gerova and he concealed the fraudulent scheme and did not report the same to law enforcement authorities.

There is really no dispute that he allowed his father

to have access to his law firm e-mail address, that he arranged for his father to have a phone, and that he effectuated certain transfers out of his lawyer IOLTA account, and further, that he lied to the SEC. There are disputes as to the timing of when he had guilty knowledge, and certainly that's been explored on the record here today. And the court proceeds from the assumption that that guilty knowledge occurred at some time in 2011.

The defendant is different from many people who have appeared before me in that he grew up initially or he began life in a privileged setting. His family had multiple staff members in their home in Greenwich, and they owned multiple residences in Manhattan, San Diego, Del Mar, Rancho Santa Fe. And then things changed when the defendant was a very young boy, after his father's arrest, and certainly the lifestyle of the family changed radically and his mother became a substitute teacher.

I can't imagine that it would be an easy experience for a young boy to see that. Well, Jared Galanis did something right along the way in pursuing an education, in staying productive, and he earned a JD degree from University of San Francisco, and he had a bachelor of arts degree from St. Mary's in California. Someplace along the line he also obtained an MBA degree and a master's of law, which he received about a year ago. Actually, I said MBA. There is some conflicting

information whether it was an MBA or a master of science major in financial analysis. But, in any event, he did obtain an additional degree.

He is not a young man. He is 37 years of age. He is a person different from his father. He knew of his father's history. As an individual, he's allowed to love his father, even with all the wrongful conduct he may have engaged in or did engage in and despite his criminal background. But as a smart person, a lawyer, well-educated person, he crossed the line into criminal behavior in knowing of his father's criminal conduct and concealing it and lying about it, and that is why he is called upon to pay a heavy price.

He will no longer practice law, and as part of this sentencing proceeding, I am directing him to notify any jurisdiction, state or federal, where he is admitted to practice law of the fact of his conviction and enclosing a copy of the judgment of conviction. That is to avoid doubt, and that will be one of the conditions of supervised release in this case.

He has a wife who is also well-educated as a software engineer and a computer science professor. And since 2003, she has suffered from a disease known as Ehlers Danlos syndrome, a group of genetic connective tissue disorders. And while there are a lot of discussions, many discussions, of the disease and of her symptoms, there is just no doubt that his wife has

undergone multiple surgeries, including spinal surgery in

December 2015 to implant an intracranial pressure device to

monitor the pressure inside the skull, and in July 2016, to

treat something known as Eagle syndrome and left internal

jugular vein stenosis. His wife receives disability benefits

and wears a neck brace daily and is unable to engage in many of

the ordinary life functions or engage in them with any great

ease. By all reports, the defendant has been a devoted spouse.

So this is a particularly difficult sentencing decision in this case. The Office of Probation has given the following recommendation to the court, though the guideline range is 21 to 27 months' imprisonment. They recommend that I sentence the defendant to three months' imprisonment.

I don't think that the recommendation quite fits the conduct, but I do conclude that on the confluence of circumstances, including the role in the offense and the extraordinary care that Jared Galanis is called upon to give to his wife, that a sentence of 150 days' imprisonment, of one-year supervised release, and waiver of the fine based on limited assets and limited earning ability, and the imposition of a \$100 special amendment is sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the purposes of Section 3553(a).

Does the defendant or his counsel have any objection to the court's proposed sentence or to the statement of reasons for that sentence?

MR. LASSART: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Same question for the government.

MS. HECTOR: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: The defendant will please stand and I will impose sentence.

Jared Galanis, it is the judgment of this court that you're hereby remanded to the custody of the United States
Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for 150 days. Following release from imprisonment, you shall be placed on supervised release with the following terms and conditions: You shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime, nor illegally possess a controlled substance, nor possess a firearm or destructive device. You shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance and submit to one drug test within 15 days of placement on supervised release and at least two scheduled drug tests thereafter. You shall cooperate in the collection of DNA.

The standard terms of supervision 1 through 13 are imposed with the following special conditions: You shall pay 15 percent of your gross monthly income towards the satisfaction of any imposition of restitution which I will make in this case, and restitution will be deferred but will be done within the next 90 days.

You shall provide probation with access to any requested financial information and shall not incur credit card

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer. You shall submit your person, residence, place of business, vehicle and any property, computer, electronic communications, data storage devices, and or other media under your control to a search on the basis that the probation officer has reasonable suspicion that contraband or evidence of a violation of the conditions of release may be The search must be conducted in a reasonable time and a reasonable manner. Failure to submit may be grounds for revocation. You shall inform any other residents that the premises may be subject to search pursuant to this condition. You shall refrain from engaging in any legal or financial transactions directly or in an advisory capacity involving your family members, your parents, and all of your siblings. This condition does not apply to you, your spouse, or any children of yours.

You shall report to the nearest probation office within 72 hours of release of custody. You may be supervised in the district of residence. As noted, you shall report to any jurisdiction where you're admitted to the bar the fact of this conviction, and enclosing a copy of the judgment of conviction. As noted and for the reasons stated, the fine is waived, and the \$100 mandatory special assessment is imposed. Restitution will be imposed at a later date.

Mr. Galanis, you have the right to appeal the sentence

I have imposed in this case. If you cannot afford the cost of 1 an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal as a poor person. 2 3 The time limits for filing a notice of appeal are strictly enforced and they are brief. If you request, the Clerk of 4 5 Court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf 6 immediately. 7 Do you understand all that? 8 MR. MADDOX: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Anything further from the government? 10 MS. HECTOR: Just that any remaining open counts be 11 dismissed. THE COURT: All right. Any open remaining counts as 12 13 to Jared Galanis are dismissed. 14 Let me hear you with regard to surrender date. Let me 15 propose something and then you can tell me whether it works. March 14 at 2:00 p.m. to the institution designated by 16 17 the Bureau of Prisons, or if none is designated, then to the United States Marshal for this district. 18

In terms of recommendation as to location, as close as feasible to Maryland, is that the request?

MR. LASSART: Yes, your Honor.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And that request will be made.

Anything else from the defendant?

MR. LASSART: No, your Honor. Thank you. We will be surrendering on the Ides of March.

THE COURT: Please be seated, if you will.

Mr. Galanis, I choose to believe the statements that you made today. This is an ugly and very costly chapter in your life. You have obligations to your wife, your wife's family, and those who have stood by you in this time of need, as well as to the victims of this fraud. I believe you will make amends, and I sincerely hope that you will get past this episode and live a law-abiding life, and perhaps be an example to others of the costly consequences of a mistake like this. And when I say mistake, it's not a mistake, it's a crime.

We are adjourned.

12 000